UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	103251.58983US	5757

23911   7590   10/13/2009
CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER
PULLIAM, CHRISTYANN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/865,773	SUDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christyann RF Pulliam	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 July 2009 and 07 October 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>149-153</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>149-153</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/7/2009</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)   Paper No(s)/Mail. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Claims 149-153 are pending as filed July 10, 2009. All claims are new. Claims

1-148 are canceled.

2.   Examiner thanks the Applicant's Representative for limiting the variations on the

invention described in the claims.

3.   The Information Disclosure filed October 7, 2009 has been considered.

However, the three articles listed as C5, C6 and C7 were not provided to Examiner and

were therefore not considered.

4.   Based on the new claims filed, new grounds of rejection are provided. Therefore,

this action is FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 149-153 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Davies et al., WO 99/12108 (provided by Applicant with IDS filed Dec. 8, 2003)

(hereinafter Davies), and in view of Burner et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,548 (hereinafter

Burner).

As for Claim 149, Davies teaches:

A method of saving web page data comprising:

providing a save option within a window of a browser client (See e.g. Davies –

Figure 5 #502);

receiving a selection of the save option from a user (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5

#502);

acquiring web page data browsed by the browser client when the selection of the

save option is received from the user (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #503-504);

extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data (See e.g.

Davies – Figure 5 #507-511);

assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index unique to the acquired

web page data and a second index comprising the extracted keyword to the acquired

web page data (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #512, page 5, lines 11-14, page 7, lines 1-

15, index and keywords – pages 8-9); and

saving, subsequent to the keyword extraction, the acquired web page data

browsed by the browser client in correspondence with the assigned indices in a

predefined database, the saved web page data being sufficient to regenerate at least a

portion of a previously browsed web page without accessing to the original source (See

e.g. <u>Davies</u> – Figure 5 #509-512, Figures 2-3, page 5, lines 11-14, intelligent page store

IPS stores metadata and source con text sufficient to recreate the page, applicant

independent marked-up versions and index and keywords – pages 8-9),

     <u>Davies</u> does not make clear whether the user enters a file name or not (See e.g.

<u>Davies</u> – pages 8-9 allows user annotation and added keywords, does not appear to

require the user to name the IPS file, Figure 3 shows the IPS Files). However, <u>Burner</u>

teaches wherein the acquired web page data is saved without prompting the user for a

file name or destination folder when the selection of the save option is received from the

user (See e.g. <u>Burner</u> – Figure 11, client machines already knows information about

page to save, user does not need to enter it and Figure 12c, col. 13, line 65- col. 14, line

15). <u>Burner</u> also teaches archived versions of pages (See e.g. <u>Burner</u> - Figure 13, col.

14) as well as metadata storage, annotations, recommendations (See e.g. <u>Burner</u> – col.

2, lines 20-64, Figure 4, col.7, line 13- col. 9, line 60).

     <u>Davies</u> and <u>Burner</u> are from the analogous art of saving browsed data. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

having the teachings of <u>Davies</u> and <u>Burner</u> to have combined <u>Davies</u> and <u>Burner</u>. The

motivation to combine <u>Davies</u> and <u>Burner</u> is detail saving browsed data. Due to the

overlapping subject matter, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to

combine <u>Davies</u> and <u>Burner</u>.

As for Claim 150, <u>Davies</u> as modified by <u>Burner</u> teaches parent Claim 149.

<u>Davies</u> also teaches:

providing a second save option within the window of the browser client (See e.g.
<u>Davies</u> – Figure 5 #502);

receiving a selection of the second save option from the user (See e.g. <u>Davies</u> –
Figure 5 #502); and

acquiring web page data browsed by the browser client when the browser client
newly browses the web page data, when the selection of the second save option has
been received from the user (See e.g. <u>Davies</u> – Figure 5 #501-504, pages 8-9),

*Note: the second save option does not appear to be functionally different from
the first option. It appears to only require a second use of the save option as it is
described in this claim. Both references trigger methods when go to new page.*

<u>Davies</u> does not make clear whether the user enters a file name or not (See e.g.
<u>Davies</u> – pages 8-9 allows user annotation and added keywords, does not appear to
require the user to name the IPS file, Figure 3 shows the IPS Files). However, <u>Burner</u>
teaches wherein the acquired web page data is saved without any further instruction
from the user when the browser client is subsequently operated to move to another
URL, when the selection of the second save option has been received from the user.
(See e.g. <u>Burner</u> – Figure 11, client machines already knows information about page to
save, user does not need to enter it and Figure 12c, col. 13, line 55- col. 14, line 15).

As for Claim 151, <u>Davies</u> as modified by <u>Burner</u> teaches parent Claims 149-150. <u>Burner</u> also teaches wherein the second save option includes a user selectable option to save only links of the browsed data or page contents of the browsed data (See e.g. <u>Burner</u> – Figures 11-12d). <u>Davies</u> teaches saving links and content (See e.g. <u>Davies</u> – page 10, lines 1-5 and page 9, lines 1-10).

As for Claim 152, <u>Davies</u> as modified by <u>Burner</u> teaches parent Claims 149-150. <u>Burner</u> teaches wherein the second save option further includes an exclusion option that excludes saving particular web pages (See e.g. <u>Burner</u> – col. 14, lines 23-35, col. 15, lines 40-65user control over storage of classes of pages).

As for Claim 153, <u>Davies</u> as modified by <u>Burner</u> teaches parent Claim 149. <u>Davies</u> also teaches further comprising: displaying the first or second index within the browser client, wherein when the first index is displayed, a representation of the acquired web page data is listed in an order sorted by date, and wherein when the second index is displayed the representation of the acquired web page data is listed in an order sorted by keyword (See e.g. <u>Davies</u> – page 8 -page 9, line 10 – date, keywords both stored so list can be sorted on either, page 9, line 26- page 10, line 23 – ranked lists by date stored and relevance/keywords).

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments based on the amendments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

       A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Christyann RF Pulliam whose telephone number is
(571)270-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 am-6 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Neveen Abel-Jalil can be reached on 571-272-4074. The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. R. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
October 8, 2009
        /Neveen Abel-Jalil/
        Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165